

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mouri et al in view of Badager et al.

It is true as the Examiner points out that Mouri et al disclose a recording medium having a substrate 1, an under layer 2 and an upper layer 3. The upper layer 3 is made of a flexible or elastic material which will deform to protect the recorded images corresponding to deformation of the under layer swollen by the unevaporated portion of an aqueous ink after completion of recording. The Mouri et al arrangement is very different than the present invention. After Mouri et al has recorded by ink images in under layer 2 the upper layer 3 acts as a hydrophobic protection layer. In the present invention we desire to record not only in an information receiving layer and but also in a hydrophillic layer formed over the information receiving layer. There are two separate types of information recording set forth in amended claims 1 and 2. Information in the image receiving layer and a water-based colorant image in the hydrophillic layer. Mouri et al only have information recorded in one layer and his structure would provide no motivation to provide the present invention. In fact he teaches away from the present invention. There is no way a water-based colorant image transferred by a stamp could be recorded in the upper layer of the Mouri et al structure. Accordingly, applicants fail to see how Mouri et al disclose or suggest the present invention.

Bodager et al relate to an ink jet medium having a substrate, water-absorptant layer and an ink receiving layer. After being printed with an aqueous pigmented ink the ink-receiving layer can be laminated. There is only a single image recorded in this arrangement. There is no structure which corresponds to the hydrophillic layer set forth in either claims 1 and 2. Accordingly, applicants fail to see how Bodager et al can even be reasonably be combined with Mouri et al to provide the present invention. Neither one of these arrangements has two separate and distinct information bearing layers. Bodager et al use an ink jet printer to record his ink image but has nothing corresponding to the water-based colorant image provided in a hydrophillic layer as set forth in claims 1 and 2.

Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takeyama et al in view of Jaeger et al.

Takeyama et al disclose a thermal transfer image-receiving sheet which has a substrate and image-receiving layer which is imaged with a thermally-diffusable dye. Takeyama et al do not teach a hydrophillic coating for recording. Although Takeyama et al disclose that their protective layer can include resins, the entire configuration of this layer is for absorbing UV rays and includes for example fine particles of titanium oxide and/or zinc oxide. This layer is not intended for nor it is believed that it can record a water-based colorant image. Applicants can find no reference to hydrophillic properties of this layer. In fact it should be noted that the protective layer can be coated with a surface lubricant (see col. 17, lines 33-39) which would clearly suggest that the layer is hydrophobic. In view of the foregoing it is believed that Takeyama et al should not stand in the way of the allowance of the present invention.

Jaeger et al relate to a recording material which has a receiver coated to make it receptive to water-soluble inks. The recording of water-soluble inks is well known in the art. There is no way this reference provides any suggestion of the present invention which has an information receiving layer and a hydrophillic water-based colorant image receiving layer. Nor would there be any motivation to use this layer in any of the references cited by the Examiner, since none of these references desire or suggest having two separate image receiving layers.

It is believed that these changes now make the claims clear and definite and, if there are any problems with these changes, Applicants' attorney would appreciate a telephone call.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed none of the references, taken singly or in combination, disclose the claimed invention. Accordingly, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance, the notice of which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 22,363

Raymond L. Owens/das  
Rochester, NY 14650  
Telephone: (716) 477-4653  
Facsimile: (716) 477-4646

Enclosure: Letter to the Draftsperson  
Copies of formal drawings